

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on March 7, 2005 and is being filed pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) as provided under 37 CFR 1.114. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-19, 22 and 24-27 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1, 3-5, 10, 11, 13, 22, 24 and 27; and 2) canceled no claims. As such, claims 1-19, 22, and 24-27 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now presented.

In the office action dated March 7, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-17, 22 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0130904 (hereinafter "Becker") in view of Tang, et al., U.S. Patent 6,731,308 (hereinafter "Tang"); Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker, in view of Tang and further in view of Vaananen, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0014456 (hereinafter "Vaananen"); Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Tang and further in view of Helfman, et al., U.S. Patent 6,396,513 (hereinafter "Helfman").

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14-17, 22, & 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0130904 (hereinafter "Becker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,308 (hereinafter "Tang").

Claim 1:

As to Claim 1, Examiner has indicated that the Becker with Tang would have been obvious to combine to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. The prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Amended Claim 1 recites:

A method of displaying a plurality of concurrent IM sessions:
 providing a graphical interface to display information
 related to a plurality of IM sessions;
 displaying a first one of the plurality of IM sessions in a
 single IM session window;
 representing each one of the plurality of IM sessions as a
 corresponding one of a plurality of indicators in the single IM
session window;
 receiving a plurality of messages in one or more of the
 plurality of IM sessions; and
 indicating the number of messages received in each of
the indicators which corresponds to the one or more of the
plurality of IM sessions.

(Emphasis added). Applicants point out that the number of messages received is indicated in each of the indicators, where each indicator is in the single IM session window and represents each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions. As the Examiner has noted, Becker does not describe or illustrate how many messages the user received for any one of the recipients (or tab sessions).

Applicants point out that Tang does not teach or suggest the number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Rather, Tang discloses an information window (Fig. 5A, numeral 62) that contains the number of unread email and unheard voicemail messages. This information window appears in a separate and different window from the single IM session window, which only appears after selecting the indicator representing a corresponding IM session (i.e. “Janak’s name—a visual representation of Janak in contact list 60a). (See Tang; Fig. 5A; col. 9, lines 26-38). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Becker and Tang, when combined, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 1, and thus the rejection for Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that amendments to Claim 1 are for clarification purposes and have added no new matter. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification; and more specifically, support can be found at least in Fig. 3 and paragraph 0019, wherein a single IM session window is illustrated and described.

Claims 2-7, 9-11, & 14-17:

Claims 2-7, 9-11, & 14-17 are dependent (either directly or indirectly) on Claim 1, and are patentable at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection for Claims 2-7, 9-11, & 14-17 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

Additionally, as to Claim 7, Applicant points out that Becker in view of Tang does not teach or suggest a method wherein indicating the number of messages comprises displaying a number of first symbols within each of the indicators corresponding to the number of messages. Rather, Tang merely displays a number corresponding to the number of messages, not a number of first symbols corresponding to the number of messages (i.e. 2 symbols for 2 messages).

Applicants note that amendments to Claim 3-5, 10, & 11 are for clarification purposes and have added no new matter. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification; and more specifically, support can be found at least in Fig. 3 and paragraph 0019, wherein a single IM session window is illustrated and described.

Claim 22:

Independent Claim 22 has been amended for clarity to recite in part, “a plurality of indicators, displayed in the single IM session window, representing...”. No new matter has been added and support for the amendment can be found throughout the drawings and specification; specifically, support can be found at least in Fig. 3 and paragraph 0019. Similar arguments as for Claim 1 can be made to demonstrate that the combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest the number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the

combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Claim 22, and thus the rejection for Claim 22 should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 & 27:

As to independent Claims 24 & 27, similar arguments as for Claim 1 can be made to demonstrate that the combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest the number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Claim 24 or 27, and thus the rejection for Claim 24 & 27 should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that amendments to Claim 24 & 27 are for clarification purposes and have added no new matter. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification; and more specifically, support can be found at least in Fig. 3 and paragraph 0019, wherein a single IM session window is illustrated and described.

Claims 25-26:

Claims 25-26 are dependent directly on Claim 24, and are patentable at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 24. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection for Claims 25-26 be withdrawn.

Claim 12 & 13:

The Examiner rejected Claims 12 & 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0130904 (hereinafter "Becker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,308 (hereinafter "Tang") and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0014456 (hereinafter "Vaananen").

Applicants points out that Claims 12 & 13 are dependent (directly or indirectly) on Claim 1, and for at least the reasons stated above for Claim 1, the combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest the number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Furthermore, Vaananen also does not teach or suggest a number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Becker, Tang, and Vaananen do not teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 12 or 13, and thus the rejection for Claims 12 & 13 should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that amendments to Claim 13 are for clarification purposes and have added no new matter. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings and specification; and more specifically, support can be found at least in Fig. 3 and paragraph 0019, wherein a single IM session window is illustrated and described.

Claims 18 & 19:

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Tang and further in view of Helfman, et al., U.S. Patent 6,396,513 (hereinafter "Helfman").

Applicants points out that Claims 18 & 19 are dependent (directly or indirectly) on Claim 1, and for at least the reasons stated above for Claim 1, the combination of Becker and Tang do not teach or suggest the number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Furthermore, Helfman also does not teach or suggest a number of messages received in each of the indicators (representing each corresponding one of the plurality of IM sessions) that are present in the single IM session window. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Becker, Tang, and Helfman do not teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 12 or 13, and thus the rejection for Claims 18 & 19 should be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Thomas C. Webster at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully Submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/7, 2005


Thomas C. Webster
Reg. No.: 46,154

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300